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Abstract

This study is an attempt to understand the mechanism driving programs of journalism and mass communication to converge media sequences. The study also describes the extent and variation of these changes. Findings from a national survey show that a majority of programs are at least experimenting with convergence, though most are also maintaining specialized tracks in some form. Findings also suggest that faculty perceptions of industry changes explain movement away from a sole reliance on separate tracks, but small program size and lack of accreditation are more important in explaining the decision to merge sequences.
Recent research suggests many journalism and mass communication programs are taking steps toward convergence in their journalism curricula. These steps vary in nature from tentative tinkering with courses to full-scale merging of journalism and broadcasting sequences. Presumably such changes are spurred by a perceived need to reshape skills in the rising labor force so they reflect changing needs of journalism organizations. Yet the industry has been exploring convergence in only a tentative way, apart from a handful of high-profile cases.

What is moving programs toward convergence if the market does not presently demand this movement? This study seeks to answer this question. In so doing, the study explores the mechanism driving curriculum change. Concepts from the sociology of organizations are used to develop predictors of change, including external factors from the economic and professional environment and internal factors such as structure and faculty characteristics. Specifically, the study analyzes (1) variation from traditional “medium-specific” curricula to curricula that train students across media platforms, (2) variation in attitudes among administrators and faculty about convergence and (3) possible causes of these variations. Findings suggest that faculty perceptions of industry changes explain movement away from a sole reliance on separate tracks, but small program size and lack of accreditation are more important in explaining the decision to merge sequences.

Convergence in the industry

The concept of media convergence dates back several decades. In the mid 1970s, convergence referred to the coming together of telecommunications and computer technology. De Sola Pool in the early 1980s spoke of “convergence of delivery mechanisms for news and information,” while Fidler said media convergence was the coming together of diverse technologies and forms of media. Convergence has also been defined fairly narrowly as the integration of broadband systems with other industries. In an undergraduate text on converging media, Pavlik and McIntosh define convergence more broadly as the “coming together of computing, telecommunications, and media in a digital environment.” In all these definitions, the concept of convergence involves a “coming together,” “boundary blurring,” or merging, which
can take place at different levels. Media corporations merge assets, technologies and technological processes merge, local media operations merge staffs, production processes and information, and news stories on the Web can merge modes of symbolic expression.  

For the present study, convergence is defined as a merging of specialized knowledge areas associated with organizational work for particular media platforms. At issue in this study is teaching these merged knowledge areas to future workers. This definition of convergence implies a merging at the operational level—e.g., a local TV station and a newspaper integrating work routines, work roles and production processes. It does not assume technological merging (TV and newspaper technologies can still be separate), or even a merging at the corporate level.

Few local TV stations or newspapers are presently engaging in substantial convergence efforts. In one recent study, only 7.5% of TV staff and 3.1% of newspaper staff surveyed reported being required to take part in efforts to converge operations. In a recent national survey of daily newspapers and local TV news operations, 226 of 502 reported having some kind of a relationship with the other types of media (TV with newspaper, newspaper with TV), but a small percentage of these engaged in practices that require staff to have production skills in both TV and newspapers. According to the American Press Institute’s “convergence tracker,” as of June 2004 around 60 newspapers are pursuing partnerships with broadcast/cable media. Presently there are 1,457 daily newspapers and 1,744 local TV stations in the United States. Even the success of high-profile convergence efforts in the industry has been called into question. For example, recent research on the widely-publicized convergence operation involving The Tampa Tribune, WFLA-TV and Tampa Bay Online.com shows that much of what is called “convergence” is cross-promotion.

A number of constraints on convergence in the industry have been cited. These include incompatibilities of culture and work processes between broadcast and print journalists, lack of training, lack of financial resources and the lack of modern multimedia editing systems. Whatever the causes, the converged news media world predicted by many is not a current reality.

**Convergence and curriculum change**
In recent years the topic of curriculum convergence has been popular among journalism and mass communication educators. In 2001 authors of a white paper for AEJMC recommended that academic programs follow the lead of media organizations that cut across media boundaries in their newsrooms.\textsuperscript{16} From 2001 to 2003, 14 panels on the topic of converged media took place at conventions of the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication.

It appears many programs are moving from discussion to experimentation. A 2003 study found that about half of a sample of 300 journalism and mass communication programs have made some changes to curriculum to address convergence.\textsuperscript{17} However, the movement toward convergence is cautious. A 2003 survey of a sample of 46 top-tier journalism programs found that 85\% have begun to pursue curricula that address media convergence, but most schools still maintain separate tracks for print and broadcast.\textsuperscript{18}

According to Cuban, a leading scholar of education reform, curriculum change is commonly hesitant and skin-deep. Schools tend to “absorb external pressures for change and convert them into routine add-ons compatible with existing perspectives.” \textsuperscript{19} Cuban says reactions to external factors are frequently cosmetic rather than structural, serving to show external groups, on whom schools depend for resources, that schools are responsive to their concerns and to current trends. Internal influences from administrators, teachers and students often constrain change.

Findings from case studies of programs pursuing convergence tend to support Cuban’s observation that internal influences constrain change. A study of a converged student newsroom at Brigham Young University revealed cultural obstacles, as journalism students were found to be more skeptical about the operation than broadcast majors.\textsuperscript{20} According to Utsler, identification with a particular media type by students and faculty proved to be an obstacle to convergence efforts at the University of Kansas,\textsuperscript{21} as was lack of faculty skills across media types.\textsuperscript{22} Artwick cited internal political divisions as an obstacle, likening convergence efforts at Washington and Lee to the difficult process of “dismantling silos.”\textsuperscript{23}

\textit{Concepts and hypotheses}
This study posits three stages of curricular reform: static, supplementary, and realigned. Programs at the static stage have opted to stay with their traditional curricula. In the case of converged curricula, programs in the static stage emphasize medium-specific training over cross-media training. Programs in the supplementary stage hedge their bets. They maintain the traditional curriculum but supplement with additional courses or sequences that address the perceived pressure. In the present case, programs in the supplemental stage maintain separate media tracks but have added courses or sequences that address the perceived phenomenon of converged media. Programs in the realigned stage reconceptualize and reshape their overall curricula structures in response to perceived pressures. This stage entails a greater commitment than the supplemental stage. It is assumed that programs in the static stage have the least converged curricula, programs in the realigned stage are most converged, and programs in the supplementary stage are moderately converged, falling between the static and realigned stages.

To understand why programs are in particular stages, it is necessary to understand the mechanism that drives them to these positions. Both the literature on media convergence and the educational literature on curriculum change suggest that academic programs, like all organizations, are subject to external and internal pressures on decision-making. These pressures may be tangible or perceived.

Increasingly, organizational scholars have focused on environmental factors as predictors of organizational decision-making, and the literature on curriculum change has a similar focus. However, programs moving toward a converged curriculum are not experiencing a great deal of actual pressure from the external marketplace. Institutional theory from the organizations literature offers an explanation. According to the theory, tangible environmental pressures may not be the primary motivators of decision-making in organizations. Instead, the perceived need to maintain legitimacy may be the key. Organizations are likely to mimic other organizations and their environment so that the public, clients and other professionals perceive the organization as socially and culturally legitimate. This is especially true in changing and uncertain environments. Legitimacy and commonality with other industries and organizations tend to lead to increased resources.
Factors from within the organization constrain the influence of external pressures and perceived external pressures. Such pressures can stimulate change only if the organization possesses the internal resources necessary to bring about change. Organizational size and structure can also constrain decisions for change.

**Hypotheses**

A number of hypotheses have been generated from these observations. The first hypothesis proposes that programs associated with professional organizations should be more likely to pursue a converged curriculum. In other words, programs should be most likely to fall in the realigned stage, least likely to fall in the static stage and moderately likely to fall in the supplemental stage. This relationship should exist because “cutting edge” change is given legitimacy through professional organizations, exposure to such ideas is more likely through professional channels, and organizations tend to seek commonality by mimicking one another as a response to uncertainty.

H1: Programs that are members of professional organizations are more likely than programs that are not members of professional organizations to pursue a converged curriculum.

The second hypothesis is based on the premise that organizations experiencing uncertainty seek to be “more like” their institutional environment. This is especially the case for institutions on which the organization is dependent for resources. News organizations supply journalism programs with resources in the form of jobs and internships for students, grants and adjunct faculty. It is therefore in these programs’ best interest to project an “up-to-date” image to the industry. It should be therefore, that the more journalism and mass communication programs perceive that news organizations are pursuing convergence, the more these programs will pursue converged curriculum themselves.

H2: The greater the perception within programs that the news industry is moving toward convergence, the more converged the program’s curriculum will be.
Though marketplace pressures are weak, other concrete external pressures may exert pressure. For example, availability of incoming students should have an influence. Organizations seek control through predictability, and therefore uncertainty about flow of resources (such as enrollment) may drive an organization to change. By this logic, journalism and mass communication programs with recent drops in enrollment should be more likely to chance pursuing a revised curriculum.

H3: The greater the drop in recent enrollment levels, the more converged the program’s curriculum will be.

External governing bodies are another potentially potent external force. The Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) restricts number of credit hours in journalism and mass communication programs\(^2\) It should be that non-accredited programs will have more flexibility and will therefore be freer to experiment with the curriculum restructuring necessary to pursue multimedia journalism or convergence.

H4: Non-accredited programs are more likely than accredited programs to pursue a converged curriculum.

The size of programs should shape convergence efforts. Larger programs are more likely to thoroughly differentiate into media emphases (broadcast, print, etc.) and are therefore more likely to experience political obstacles to convergence. It is proposed that greater differentiation (i.e., less merging of tracks) should result from greater organizational size.

H5: The larger the program the less likely it will pursue a converged curriculum.
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A shortage of internal resources should constrain efforts to change curriculum, and one such resource is faculty time. At programs with fewer students per faculty member, faculty should have more time to work on curriculum matters.

H6: The higher the ratio of faculty to students, the more likely a program will have pursued a converged curriculum.

Having a graduate program also should have an influence. The more integral the graduate program is to a school, the less time faculty will spend on undergraduate matters – which is most commonly the level at which a converged curriculum is pursued.

H7: The larger the graduate program is relative to the rest of the program, the less converged the school’s curriculum will be.

The location of the school within the overall university structure should have an impact as well. Schools that are independent units should have fewer administrative constraints on pursuing non-traditional directions, such as converging curricula.

H8: Programs that are independent units are more likely to pursue a converged curriculum than programs that are not independent units.

Finally, faculty are likely to influence the decision to pursue converged curriculum. This statement is not as obvious as it seems on its face. Administrative decision-making is under pressure from a variety of sources, faculty being but one. Nevertheless, it should be that the more faculty are interested in converged curriculum, the more converged the curriculum will be.

H9: The stronger the faculty interest in pursuing a converged curriculum, the more likely the program will train students across media types.
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Predictors of converged curriculum may influence level of converged curriculum through their influence on faculty interest. Therefore the relationships between the external and internal predictors above and faculty interest as a dependent variable also will be examined.

**Method**

Data to test these hypotheses were gathered in the 2002 *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*, which has been in existence since the 1930s and is presently conducted at the University of Georgia. A combination of the *AEJMC Directory* and *The Journalist's Road to Success: A Career Guide* produced a listing of 463 programs. Questionnaires were mailed to administrators of each program in October 2002. Three subsequent mailings were sent and follow-up phone calls were made to obtain data from non-responding schools. The questionnaire asked the administrators to provide information on enrollment by year in school, by sequence and by demographic categories, as well as number and type of degrees granted. Administrators also were asked questions about attitude toward converged curriculum, level of convergence in present curriculum and perception of industry trends toward convergence. Ultimately data were obtained for all 463 programs, though there was variation in the detail and precision of the information provided.

Level of converged curriculum was measured on a three-point scale by the question: “To what degree does your curriculum incorporate training across media types? (1 = Specializes in particular media types more than learn across media types, 2 = Students both learn skills across media types and specialize, 3 = Students learn across media types more than specialize).” Degree to which the faculty favored pursuing convergence was measured on a five-point scale by the question: “How interested is your faculty in pursuing a converged curriculum” (1 = Not at all interested, 5 = Very interested). Converged curriculum was defined for respondents as a curriculum that emphasized training across media types more than specializing in a single media type. Though questioning the program administrator is not an ideal way to measure faculty attitudes, program administrators are typically faculty members. There should be a reasonable correspondence with faculty sentiment.
Program affiliation with ASJMC was obtained through official membership files, and data for accreditation with ACEJMC were obtained from listings on the Web and from the AEJMC Directory. Both of these measures were scored as dichotomous (0=no membership, 1=membership; 0=not accredited, 1=accredited). Just under a quarter were accredited by ACEJMC.

Perception of industry hiring was measured by asking administrators “How interested do you think employers are in training graduates across media types?” and “How interested do you think employers will be in five years in training graduates across media types?” These five-point scale measures were summed (M = 8.25, s.d. = 1.6, range = 2 to 10). Drop in enrollment level was measured by computing percent change between enrollment levels in 1996 and 2002. The 1996 data were obtained from the 1996 Enrollment Survey, and the 2002 were obtained from the 2002 survey. All increases in enrollment were scored as zero so that the measure only assesses degree to which enrollment level dropped (M = -.08, s.d. = .18).

Program size was measured through undergraduate enrollment figures for 2002 (M = 393.4, s.d. = 463.23). Ratio of faculty to students was computed using undergraduate enrollment size and faculty size measures from the survey. Full-time faculty counted as one, and part-time faculty counted as half of one (M = .06, s.d. = .05). Emphasis on the graduate program was computed by dividing the number of enrolled graduate students (Ph.D. and master’s) by the total number of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled (M = .05, s.d. = .12). This created a scale from 0 to 1, with 0 = programs with no graduate students and 1 = programs with only graduate students. Finally, the relative independence of the program within the larger school was measured by asking administrators whether their program was an “independent school or college, or a unit in a larger college” (yes = 16.4%). This variable is dichotomous, with 0=not independent and 1=independent.

To test hypotheses, a multiple discriminant analysis was conducted, in which level of convergence is treated as an ordinal-level variable, and predictors are assessed for their ability to differentiate among journalism and mass communication programs that 1) are in the static stage, or emphasize specialized tracks more than convergence, that 2) are in the supplemental stage, or
pursue both specialized tracks and convergence, and that 3) are in the realigned stage, or emphasize convergence more than specialized tracks. This analysis tests predictors while controlling for all other predictors.

To test relationships between predictors and faculty interest in convergence, a multiple regression analysis was conducted.

**Results**

Data show that just less than 85% of respondents say their current curriculum either emphasizes convergence (31.7%) or both specialized tracks and convergence (52.6%). Most programs pursue the middle course. Three-quarters of program administrators say their faculty is either interested or very interested in pursuing a converged curriculum. Just less than 70% say they believe employers in the media industry are interested or very interested in hiring graduates trained across media. Just over 70% have at least one course designed to teach online or Web-based journalism skills. Two in 10 have a sequence in Web-based media, and 60.5% say they want to add one.

The discriminant analysis revealed two functions, each of which is a significant predictor of level of converged curriculum (Wilks' Lambda = .77, chi-square = 57.1, p<.01; Wilks' Lambda = .93, chi-square = 16.9, p<.05). Each of these two functions is a combination of weighted predictors that help explain why programs fall in the three categories. The functions correctly classified 60.0% of all the cases into their original groups. This “hit rate” is not high, but it is in the range of acceptability.¹ The overall model can be said to be marginally effective in classifying programs into the three categories, though clearly other important predictors exist that are not tested here.

The first function discriminates between (1) programs that emphasize specialized tracks and (2) programs that pursue both specialized tracks and convergence. In other words, the function explains why journalism and mass communication programs pursue some level of convergence, whether half-heartedly or whole-heartedly, instead of emphasizing specialization

¹ According to Hair et al. (1998), a discriminatory model is good if the hit rate is close to or exceeds the percent chance of categorizing correctly by pure chance multiplied by 1.25. In this case the multiplication produces a percentage of 61.7%, which slightly exceeds the model’s predictive hit rate of 60%.
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(Table 1). The strongest predictor loading on this function is Faculty Interest, followed by Accreditation Status (non-accredited schools are more likely to pursue convergence) and Faculty-Student Ratio. ASJMC membership (non-members are more likely to pursue convergence) and Perception of Industry Convergence are marginally predictive. No other factor loads above .30, a rule-of-thumb minimum level for meaningful predictors.31

This finding reflects the importance of faculty interest and resources. Reshaping or adding courses to create a converged curriculum requires individual motivation and sufficient time to do the revising. These findings lend support to hypotheses 6 and 9. Also important in this function is the external factor of accreditation status. As predicted by Hypothesis 4, programs that are accredited by ACEJMC are more likely to keep tracked specializations intact, a finding that suggests accreditation guidelines constrain program flexibility.

The second function discriminates between (1) programs that pursue both specialized tracks and convergence and (2) programs that emphasize either specialization or convergence. In other words, the function explains why more than half of the sampled schools play it safe by both experimenting with convergence and maintaining specialized tracks. The dominant predictor of this function is the perception that the industry is, or will be, hiring graduates who have been trained across different media types. This finding, in addition to the marginal loading on the first function, lends some support to Hypothesis 2, which posits perception of industry hiring as a predictor. Apparently belief that the industry is converging is strong enough to push schools toward a convergence effort, but there is still a degree of uncertainty and caution. It also may be that perception of industry convergence merely encourages programs to *appear* to keep up with trends – surface changes are less of an investment than fundamental restructuring of the curriculum. Membership in the professional organization ASJMC is the second important predictor of this middle category (members are more likely to pursue this middle course), and faculty interest is also somewhat predictive.

Means comparisons of the independent variables (Table 2) show that faculty interest and a lack of ASJMC association are both slightly more predictive of pursuing convergence than of pursuing both convergence and specialized tracks. Lack of ACEJMC accreditation and smaller
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program size also predict pursuing a more fully converged curriculum. It appears that smaller programs with fewer formal attachments to the profession are more likely to train students across media and to eschew specialization.

Overall, findings from the discriminant analysis suggest support for hypotheses predicting relationships between level of converged curriculum and faculty interest in convergence, perception of industry hiring, ratio of faculty to students, accreditation status and ASJMC membership. Perception that the industry will be hiring cross-trained graduates leads programs to experiment with convergence but not to discard the tried and true approach of specialized tracks. Means analysis suggests smaller programs that are less strongly connected with professional academic groups and rules are the most likely to take the leap into non-specialized, converged curricula. Findings suggest little support for hypotheses predicting effects from enrollment drop, from degree of emphasis on a graduate program, or from relative independence of the unit.

Faculty interest in converged curricula was treated as a dependent variable in a regression model (Table 3). Predictors in the model explained 28% of faculty interest in converged curricula (R-square = .28), and most of this common variance resulted from the predictor perception of industry hiring (beta = .51). No other predictor proved important.

Discussion

Findings suggest that the issue of industry convergence is on the minds of most program administrators and faculty. Findings also suggest programs are moving toward converged tracks – i.e., tracks that merge the teaching of knowledge areas associated with particular media platforms. Albeit, they do this slowly and cautiously. The perception that the news industry is seeking, or will be seeking, to hire cross-skilled graduates is a key to explaining movement toward converged curricula. This perception of the industry drives faculty interest in converged curriculum, and in turn, faculty interest in convergence drives programs away from exclusively training for specialized media forms. Also, results show that the perception of the industry has some direct impact on actual decisions about curriculum. Faculty-to-student ratio also has an effect on curriculum change, suggesting that faculty must have sufficient time to design, advocate and implement changes.
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Faculty interest and perception of industry hiring do not explain why some programs pursue convergence rather than pursuing both convergence and specialization. Less professionally connected and less professionally constrained programs are the most likely to take convergence to another level by emphasizing training across media. Institutional theory suggests that programs that are strongly connected with the wider profession are more likely merely to make a show of pursuing convergence. The theory suggests such programs pursue change “on the surface” because this sufficiently affords them legitimacy within the profession. As Cuban suggests, it may not be necessary to fundamentally restructure a curriculum if the aim is simply to maintain legitimacy.

Smaller programs are also more likely to pursue converged curricula. Smaller programs are less structurally complex and have less rigidly differentiated tracks, and potentially this would make it easier to converge. Programs that have weaker ties with the profession are also less likely to feel the reinforcing effects of external professional structures on track differentiation. Therefore such programs may feel freer to pursue fundamental structural change.

Larger, more mainstream programs should monitor the consequences of fundamental change within smaller, less mainstream programs. If such changes prove beneficial, larger programs should take a hard look at the factors constraining their own change – e.g., accreditation constraints, political divisions, and professional norms that encourage programs to play it safe. If such changes prove detrimental, larger programs may consider moving back toward specialized tracks. Decision-making about convergence is the exemplar in this paper, but it may be possible to apply lessons learned here to various kinds of curriculum change. Further research should compare these findings with analyses of other types of curriculum change to see if they hold up across exemplars.

The explanatory power of the perception of industry trends shows how important it is that these perceptions be as accurate as possible. It is increasingly difficult to obtain thorough data from the industry, but is in the best interest of industry professionals that they provide these data to programs. These programs provide the skills and expertise that news organizations need in their labor force.
Table 1: Results of multiple discriminant analysis: Loadings on the two functions. Higher scores indicate higher loadings on functions, which indicates stronger prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function 1: Function discriminates between (1) JMC programs that emphasize specialized tracks and (2) programs that either pursue both specialized tracks and convergence, or emphasize convergence. Higher loadings more strongly predict non-specialized curricula. Wilks’ Lambda=.77 Chi-square=57.14</th>
<th>Function 2: Function discriminates between (1) JMC programs that pursue both specialized tracks and convergence and (2) programs that either emphasize specialized tracks or emphasize convergence. Higher loadings more strongly predict pursuing both specialized tracks and convergence. Wilks’ Lambda=.93 Chi-square=16.92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASJMC membership (0=not a member, 1 = member)</td>
<td>ASJMC membership (0=not a member, 1 = member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of industry hiring (1=least interested in hiring cross-trained grads, 10 = most interested)</td>
<td>Perception of industry hiring (1=least interested in hiring cross-trained grads, 10 = most interested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in enrollment</td>
<td>Drop in enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation status (0=not accredited, 1=accredited)</td>
<td>Accreditation status (0=not accredited, 1=accredited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program size (enrollment)</td>
<td>Program size (enrollment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of faculty to students</td>
<td>Ratio of faculty to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on graduate program</td>
<td>Emphasis on graduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of unit (e.g., program, school) (0=not independent, 1=independent unit)</td>
<td>Independence of unit (e.g., program, school) (0=not independent, 1=independent unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty interest in converged curriculum</td>
<td>Faculty interest in converged curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Comparison of means of independent variables across three categories of the dependent variables (i.e., types of curricula).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emphasize specialized tracks</th>
<th>Pursue both specialized tracks and convergence</th>
<th>Emphasize convergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASJMC membership</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0=not a member, 1 = member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of industry hiring</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=least interested in hiring cross-trained grads, 10 = most interested)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in enrollment</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation status</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0=not accredited, 1=accredited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program size (enrollment)</td>
<td>417.54</td>
<td>379.75</td>
<td>380.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of faculty to students</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on graduate program</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of unit</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0=not independent, 1=independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty interest in converged curriculum</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Faculty Interest in Converged Curriculum regressed on internal and external predictors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL PREDICTORS</th>
<th>Faculty interest in converged curriculum (N = 423)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASJMC membership</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of industry hiring</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in enrollment</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation status (0 = not accredited, 1 = accredited)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL PREDICTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program size (enrollment)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of faculty to students</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on graduate program</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of unit (0 = not independent, 1 = independent)</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coefficients in table are beta weights.*
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